

Ser. No10/051,664

PATENT
01P16949US01

REMARKS

Claims 1, 11 and 26 are amended to more clearly define the invention.

Independent claims 28 and 29 are added. Claim 28 is a combination of claim 2 and claim 1 (prior to the claim 1 amendment made herein). Claim 29 is a combination of claim 6 and claim 1 (prior to the claim 1 amendment made herein).

Support for the amendments that indicate the system **initiates scheduling** of a task sequence in response to receiving a "message identifying occurrence of said event" and "determination pre-conditions associated with said task sequence are satisfied" (e.g., of claim 1), is found in the Application on page 8 lines 26 – 28 and page 12 lines 28 – 31 and in Figures 2 and 6 and other places.

I. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 1, 2, 3, 6, 9-13, 19-23, 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,692,125 – Schloss et al. These claims, as amended, are deemed to be patentable for the reasons given below.

Amended claim 1 recites in "a system for scheduling a first process, comprising a set of tasks, to be performed by at least one individual to support healthcare delivery, a method for processing an event representing a change in circumstances potentially affecting healthcare delivered to a patient" comprising "associating in a repository, at least one event potentially affecting healthcare delivered to a patient with a sequence of tasks to be performed to support healthcare delivery to said patient; receiving a message identifying occurrence of said event; determining by using said repository, a particular sequence of tasks to be performed, in response to receiving said message identifying occurrence of said event; and initiating scheduling of performance of said particular sequence of tasks by at least one individual in response to receiving said message identifying occurrence of said event and determination pre-conditions associated with said task sequence are satisfied and said tasks of said task sequence are ready for performance by said at least one individual". These features are not shown (or suggested) in Schloss.

The method of amended claim 1 supports "initiating scheduling of performance of said particular sequence of tasks by at least one individual in response to receiving said message identifying occurrence of said event and determination pre-

Ser. No10/051,664

PATENT
01P16949US01

conditions associated with said task sequence are satisfied". The claimed arrangement initiates scheduling "in response to receiving said message identifying occurrence of said event and determination pre-conditions associated with said task sequence are satisfied and said tasks of said task sequence are ready for performance by said at least one individual". This is not shown or suggested in Schloss. This approach is fundamentally different to the Schloss approach. The claimed arrangement initiates scheduling of tasks by "determining" a "particular sequence of tasks to be performed, in response to receiving said message identifying occurrence of said event". It does this by using a repository "associating at least one "event potentially affecting healthcare delivered to a patient with a sequence of tasks to be performed to support healthcare delivery to said patient; receiving a message identifying occurrence of said event". The claimed system does not schedule tasks until an appropriate event message is received and pre-conditions for executing the tasks are satisfied and the tasks of said task sequence are ready for performance by the at least one individual.

Schloss discloses "a system and method that schedules one or more events or event groups subject to conditions" (Schloss column 2 lines 28-32". This is in direct contrast with the claimed system which does not schedule tasks until an appropriate event message is received and "pre-conditions" are "satisfied" and the tasks of said task sequence are ready for performance by the at least one individual. In Schloss, following scheduling of a task "there are dynamic conditions that must be checked (at a prepare to perform time 252, 258) and honored before performing event 1 at the performance time 256" (column 4 lines 41-43). The claimed arrangement is not shown or suggested in Schloss which teaches a system fundamentally different to that of the claimed arrangement. It is the inefficiency involved in altering and updating healthcare worker schedules because of the need to update scheduling at a "prepare to perform time" that is addressed in the claimed system. The claimed arrangement provides substantial logistical and efficiency advantages in a modern complex healthcare environment (see Application page 5 lines 19-23).

Schloss teaches the fundamentally different approach of initiating scheduling of tasks and subsequently determining if the tasks are still appropriate at a "prepare to perform time" by determining whether to cancel, alter or modify tasks if dynamic conditions associated with the tasks are not satisfied. Specifically, Schloss in the Abstract states in "a scheduling system, events and/or groups of events are checked at a scheduling time to insure that certain fixed conditions associated with the event(s) are satisfied. The events are also checked at one or more times, between

Ser. No10/051,664

PATENT
01P16949US01

scheduling time and a performance time (when the event(s) are to be performed), called ""prepare to perform time(s)."" At the prepare to perform time(s), certain dynamic conditions and/or data associated with the events are checked to determine whether the dynamic conditions are satisfied...If one or more of the dynamic conditions are not satisfied, the event(s) are...modified by cancelling, altering or postponing". Note, an event is defined differently in the claimed arrangement to the definition in Schloss. In Schloss an "event" is "any occurrence to be scheduled" (Schloss column 3 line 8) whereas in the claimed arrangement an "event" represents a "change in circumstances potentially affecting healthcare delivered to a patient". Schloss nowhere shows or suggests the claimed system which does not schedule tasks until an appropriate event message is received and "pre-conditions" are "satisfied" and the "tasks of said task sequence are ready for performance" by the at least one individual. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of amended claim 1 under 35 USC 102(b) is respectfully requested.

.. Dependent claim 2 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1. Claim 2 is also considered to be patentable because Schloss does not show (or suggest) "in response to examining predetermined information and said occurrence of said identified event, **substituting** at least one of said particular tasks for a task of an existing scheduled task sequence". Schloss nowhere mentions or contemplates "substituting" a task for another task of a workflow. Schloss in column 8 lines 27-29 (or elsewhere) does not contemplate, discuss or mention substituting a task for another task. The term "substituting" as defined and used in the application comprises replacing a task with another task, for example. This is evident from the application on page 10 lines 1-5 which indicates "Selection of item 625 results in replacement of a scheduled default workflow process (or in another embodiment, **particular identified tasks** of the default workflow process)". Schloss in column 8 lines 27-29 fails to show, suggest mention or allude to such a feature.

Dependent claim 3 recites a method in which "said message includes an **event identifier** identifying said event and is generated by a second process comprising a second set of tasks and including the activity of also receiving an **identifier identifying a particular instance** of said first process". These features, in combination with the features of claim 1, are not shown or suggested in Schloss.

Contrary to the Rejection statement on page 3 and elsewhere, Schloss in column 8 lines 21-22 does not show or suggest use of an "**identifier identifying a particular instance**" of a process. An "instance of a process" is to be interpreted as a

Ser. No10/051.664

PATENT
01P16949US01

"copy (an instance) of the desired event associated particular workflow process" (Application page 8 lines 28-30) i.e. an instance of a process is a copy of a process. This is also the meaning attributed to the term by one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. The recognition of the patentee as "his or her own lexicographer" holds even when the patentee defined the word more broadly than its ordinary meaning (Jack Guttman, Inc. v. Kopykake Enter., Inc., 302 F.3d 1352, 1360, 64 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1302, 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2002). If the patent specification defines a claim term, either expressly or by clear implication, it acts as a dictionary for interpreting that claim term (Jack Guttman, 302 F.3d 1352, 1360, 64 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1302 at 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2002), Vitronics Corp. v. Conceptronic Inc., 90 F.3d at 1582, 39 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) at 1577. Schloss in column 8 lines 21-22 does not show or suggest use of an "identifier identifying a particular" copy of a process. Schloss in column 8 lines 21-22 relied on in the Rejection merely mentions "if the event is part of an event group, each event 210 in the event group 260 will require the identifier 305". This has nothing to do with an instance or copy of process.

Schloss also fails to show or suggest use of an "event identifier" identifying an event comprising a "change in circumstances potentially affecting healthcare delivered to a patient". An "event" as used in Schloss is "any occurrence to be scheduled" i.e. a task (Schloss column 3 line 8) and is NOT a "change in circumstances potentially affecting healthcare delivered to a patient". Schloss in column 4 lines 42-44, column 7 lines 55-59 and column 8 lines 27-35 does not show or suggest such an "event identifier".

Dependent claim 6 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1 and for reasons given in connection with claim 3. Claim 6 is also considered to be patentable because Schloss does not show (or suggest) the feature combination of claim 6 involving "associating in a repository, said event with a process instance identifier identifying an instance of a process comprising said sequence of tasks". As previously explained in connection with claim 3, Schloss does not show or suggest use of a "process instance identifier". Schloss also does not suggest "associating in a repository, said event with a process instance identifier identifying an instance of a process comprising said sequence of tasks". Contrary to the Rejection statement on page 4, the event group template and pointer to a header identifier of Schloss column 7 lines 55-59 has nothing to do with a "process instance identifier".

Ser. No10/051,664

PATENT
01P16949US01

Dependent claim 9 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1.

Dependent claim 10 is considered to be patentable for reasons given in connection with claim 1 and because of its dependence on claim 1. Claim 10 is also considered to be patentable because Schloss does not show (or suggest) the feature combination involving "receiving information identifying a particular individual task of an existing scheduled task sequence and including the activity of adapting said existing scheduled task sequence by initiating processing of said existing scheduled task sequence from said identified particular individual task in response to occurrence of said event". Column 12 lines 14-16 relied on in the Rejection does NOT show or suggest "adapting said existing scheduled task sequence by initiating processing of said existing scheduled task sequence from said identified particular individual task in response to occurrence of said event". These injection and booster injection task relied on do not show the relationship claimed of "adapting said existing scheduled task sequence by initiating processing of said existing scheduled task sequence from" a particular task.

Amended independent claim 11 is considered to be patentable for reasons given in connection with claim 1.

Dependent claim 12 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 11. Claim 12 is also considered to be patentable because Schloss does not show (or suggest) the feature combination of claim 11 in which "said associated parameter is for use by multiple different process task sequences and is stored at a location available for access by said multiple different process task sequences". Contrary to the Rejection statement on page 6, Schloss provides no 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure in Figure 2, column 3 lines 40-65, column 15 lines 46-53 or elsewhere, of providing global parameters "stored at a location available for access by said multiple different process task sequences".

Dependent claim 13 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 11. Claim 13 is also considered to be patentable because Schloss does not show (or suggest) the feature combination including "verifying said associated parameter is compatible with predetermined value criteria as a pre-condition to providing said parameter to said predetermined process". The claimed arrangement initiates "scheduling of performance of said particular process in response to...determination pre-conditions associated with said task sequence are

Ser. No10/051,664

PATENT
01P16949US01

satisfied and said tasks of said task sequence are ready for performance by said at least one individual". Consequently, "verifying said associated parameter is compatible with predetermined value criteria" is performed prior to "initiating scheduling of performance of said particular process". In contrast, Schloss initiates scheduling only on "fixed conditions" and not in response to such dynamic conditions.

Dependent claim 19 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 11 and for reasons given in connection with claims 3, 7, 8 and 17. Claim 19 is also considered to be patentable because Schloss does not show (or suggest) "associating in a repository" an "event with a **process instance identifier** identifying an instance of said process comprising said sequence of tasks".

Independent claim 20 is considered to be patentable for reasons given in connection with claims 1, 3 and 6. Claim 20 is also considered to be patentable because Schloss does not show (or suggest) "a method for processing an event representing a change in circumstances potentially affecting healthcare delivered to a patient" comprising "associating in a repository, at least one event potentially affecting healthcare delivered to a patient with a **process instance identifier** identifying an instance of a process comprising a sequence of tasks to be performed to support healthcare delivery to a patient; in response to occurrence of an event in a first process, receiving at least one message identifying during said first process and identifying a parameter associated with said event; acquiring said parameter associated with said event and providing said parameter to an instance of a second process identified using said repository; and adapting said instance of said second process by scheduling performance of a particular set of tasks in response to receiving said at least one message". Schloss does not show (or suggest) "associating in a repository, at least one event potentially affecting healthcare delivered to a patient with a **process instance identifier** identifying an instance of a process comprising a sequence of tasks". Schloss does not recognize or contemplate the use of process instance identifiers (such identifiers identify copies of a process comprising a defined sequence of tasks, for example).

Schloss mentions templates as being "event groups with some omitted information that is provided by a user at scheduling time. Templates are used to facilitate the scheduling of common events and/or event groups" (Schloss column 4 line 66 to column 5 line 7). However, Schloss in column 8 lines 35-37 or elsewhere provides no mention, recognition or discussion of the use of "process instances" or

Ser. No10/051,664

PATENT
01P16949US01

"process instance identifiers". Schloss similarly does not show or suggest "adapting said instance of said second process by scheduling performance of a particular set of tasks in response to receiving said at least one message". Column 8 lines 35-37 suggests nothing about process instances at all.

Dependent claim 21 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 20 and for reasons given in connection with claim 10. Claim 21 is also considered to be patentable because Schloss does not show (or suggest) the feature combination of claim 21 together with "including the activity of receiving an identifier identifying a particular individual task in said second process and wherein said adapting activity comprises initiating processing of said second process from said particular individual task in response to receiving said at least one message identifying occurrence of said event and determination said parameter is within predetermined acceptability criteria". Schloss in column 12 lines 16-35 and column 4 lines 41-54 does not suggest a feature combination as provided by claim 21.

Dependent claim 22 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 20 and for reasons given in connection with claim 12.

Dependent claim 23 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 20. Claim 23 is also considered to be patentable because Schloss does not show (or suggest) the feature combination involving "sharing data between said first and second process comprising sharing at least one of, (a) an event identifier identifying said event, (b) a process identifier identifying said first process and (c) an identifier identifying a particular instance of said first process". As previously explained an "event" as defined in Schloss comprises "any occurrence to be scheduled" (Schloss column 3 line 8) whereas in the claimed arrangement an "event" represents a "change in circumstances potentially affecting healthcare delivered to a patient". Consequently, Schloss in column 8 lines 21-26 or elsewhere does not suggest a feature combination as provided by claim 23. Column 8 lines 21-26 merely refers to event identifiers of events comprising "any occurrence to be scheduled" (Schloss column 3 line 8) and have nothing to do with "sharing data" between a "first and second process".

Amended independent claim 26 is considered to be patentable for reasons given in connection with claim 1. Claim 26 is also considered to be patentable because Schloss does not show (or suggest) a "system for processing an event representing a change in circumstances potentially affecting healthcare delivered to a

Ser. No10/051,664

PATENT
01P16949US01

patient, said system being for use in scheduling a first process comprising a set of tasks to be performed by at least one individual to support healthcare delivery" comprising "at least one repository associating at least one event potentially affecting healthcare delivered to a patient with a sequence of tasks to be performed to support healthcare delivery to said patient; a communication interface for receiving a message identifying occurrence of said event; an event analyzer for using said at least one repository and for applying predetermined rules to interpret said identified event to determine a particular sequence of tasks to be performed in response to receiving said message identifying occurrence of said identified event; and a processor for initiating scheduling of performance of said particular tasks by at least one individual in response to said occurrence of said identified event and determination pre-conditions associated with said task sequence are satisfied and said tasks of said task sequence are ready for performance by said at least one individual".

Schloss does not show (or suggest) "initiating scheduling of performance of said particular tasks by at least one individual in response to said occurrence of said identified event and determination pre-conditions associated with said task sequence are satisfied and said tasks of said task sequence are ready for performance by said at least one individual". Schloss also does not suggest in column 14 lines 41-56 (as relied on in the Rejection on page 9) "an event analyzer for using said at least one repository and for applying predetermined rules to interpret said identified event to determine a particular sequence of tasks to be performed in response to receiving said message identifying occurrence of said identified event". As previously explained an "event" as defined in Schloss comprises "any occurrence to be scheduled" i.e. a task (Schloss column 3 line 8) whereas in the claimed arrangement an "event" represents a "change in circumstances potentially affecting healthcare delivered to a patient". Consequently, Schloss does not suggest a feature combination as provided by claim 26.

Amended dependent claim 27 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 26. Claim 27 is also considered to be patentable because Schloss does not show (or suggest) the feature combination of claim 27 including "at least one repository" that "associates said at least one event with a **process instance identifier** identifying an instance of a process comprising said sequence of tasks". As previously explained in connection with claim 20, Schloss does not suggest use of "**process instance identifier**" or such a feature combination at all. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 3, 6, 9-13, 19-23, 26 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) is respectfully requested.

Ser. No10/051,664

PATENT
01P16949US01*II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)*

Claims 4, 7, 8, 15-18, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,692,125 – Schloss et al. in view of U.S. Patent 6,401,138 – Judge et al. These claims are considered patentable for reasons given in connection with claim 1 and for the following reasons.

Dependent claim 4 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claims 1 and 3. Claim 4 is also considered to be patentable because Schloss with Judge does not show (or suggest) “said particular instance of said first process comprises a particular use of said process for a specific patient”. Contrary to the Rejection statements on page 7, neither Judge nor Schloss alone or together show or suggest use of “an event identifier identifying” a “change in circumstances potentially affecting healthcare delivered to a patient” and that is “generated by a second process comprising a second set of tasks and including the activity of also receiving an identifier identifying a particular instance of said first process” comprising a “particular use of said process for a specific patient”. As previously explained neither reference suggests use of such an “event identifier” or such a process “instance” identifier. Judge in column 21 lines 36-45, relied on in the Rejection, shows sharing patient context information between different executable applications and has no relevance to use of an identifier identifying a “particular instance of said first process” for a “particular use of said process” comprising a “set of tasks, to be performed by at least one individual to support healthcare delivery” for a “specific patient” as recited in claim 4.

As previously explained in connection with claim 3, an “instance of a process” is to be interpreted as a “copy (an instance) of the desired event associated particular workflow process” (Application page 8 lines 28-30) i.e. an instance of a process is a copy of a process. This is also the meaning attributed to the term by one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Schloss with Judge does not show or suggest use of an “identifier identifying a particular” copy of a process. Contrary to the Rejection statement on page 11, Judge in column 9 line 13 does not show or suggest use of an “identifier identifying a particular” copy of a process at all. The NT process ID relied on is merely used to identify an application called by a Windows NT operating system. Specifically, “in order to identify the application with which each PCI_ApplicationC object is associated...the NT process ID, the NT thread ID, and the NT process create time (the values required to uniquely identify

Ser. No10/051,664

PATENT
01P16949US01

an application under NT) are stored in the i_processId 256, i_threadId 258, and i_createTime 260 members, respectively" (Judge column 9 lines 10-17). Therefore neither Judge nor Schloss individually or together contemplate or suggest use of an identifier identifying a "particular instance of said first process" for a "particular use of said process"

Dependent claim 7 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1 and for reasons given in connection with claims 2 - 4. Claim 7 is also considered to be patentable because Schloss with Judge does not show (or suggest) a system involving a "message" that "includes an event identifier identifying said event and a process identifier identifying a target process to be replaced by a predetermined process comprising said particular tasks". The Rejection on page 8 relies on the erroneous premise that if a process has an identifier it would be obvious to use the identifier to identify a "target process to be replaced by a predetermined process comprising said particular tasks" in the context of the claim arrangement. The Rejection provides no showing or suggestion or motivation in either cited reference for identifying a "target process to be replaced" in any context. These features advantageously enable efficient scheduling of workflow processes in a healthcare environment avoiding the inefficiency of prior processes as exemplified by the Schloss system. There is no recognition of the advantages of the claimed system nor any motivation or other reason for modifying the Schloss and Judge systems alone or together to include the claimed arrangement.

Dependent claim 8 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claims 1 and 7 and for reasons given in connection with claims 2-7. Claim 8 is also considered to be patentable because Schloss (in column 5 lines 29-30) with Judge does not show (or suggest) a system involving "searching a database containing records indicating active processes and process instances to identify active process instances of said target process to be replaced".

Dependent claim 15 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 11 and for reasons given in connection with claim 7. Claim 15 is also considered to be patentable because Schloss with Judge does not show (or suggest) the feature combination of claim 15 in which "replacing scheduling of performance of another process with said scheduling of performance of said identified process". The Rejection provides no showing or suggestion or motivation in either cited reference, for "replacing scheduling of performance of another process with said scheduling of performance of said identified process". These features advantageously

Scr. No10/051,664

PATENT
01P16949US01

enable efficient scheduling of workflow processes in a healthcare environment avoiding the inefficiency of prior processes as exemplified by the Schloss system. There is no recognition of the advantages of the claimed system nor any motivation or other reason for modifying the Schloss and Judge systems alone or together to include the claimed arrangement.

Dependent claim 16 is considered to be patentable for reasons given in connection with claim 7.

Dependent claim 17 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claims 11 and 16. Claim 17 is also considered to be patentable because Schloss with Judge does not show (or suggest) "searching a database containing records indicating active processes and process instances to **identify active process instances** of said target process to be **replaced**". As previously explained in connection with claims 7 and 8, the Rejection provides no showing or suggestion or motivation in either cited reference for identifying a process to be "replaced" or of identifying "active process instances of said target process to be "replaced". These features advantageously enable efficient scheduling of workflow processes in a healthcare environment avoiding the inefficiency of prior processes as exemplified by the Schloss system. There is no recognition of the advantages of the claimed system nor any motivation or other reason for modifying the Schloss and Judge systems alone or together to include the claimed arrangement. Column 5 lines 29-30 of Schloss relied on in the Rejection on page 9 have nothing to do with replacing processes or active process instances.

Dependent claim 18 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 11 and for reasons given in connection with claims 3, 7, 8 and 17. Claim 18 is also considered to be patentable because Schloss with Judge does not show (or suggest) "receiving information identifying **active process instances** and storing records in a database indicating said identified active process instances".

Dependent claim 24 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 20 and for reasons given in connection with claims 3, 7, 8 and 17.

Dependent claim 25 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 20 and for reasons given in connection with claims 3, 7, 8 and

Ser. No10/051,664

PATENT
01P16949US01

17. Consequently withdrawal of the Rejection of claims 4, 7, 8, 15-18, 24 and 25 under 35 USC 103(a) is respectfully requested.

III. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 5 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,692,125 – Schloss et al. in view of U.S. Patent 6,004,276 – Wright et al. These claims are considered patentable for reasons given in connection with claim 1 and for the following reasons.

Dependent claim 5 recites a method in which “filtering a plurality of received messages to identify said message identifying occurrence of an event potentially affecting healthcare delivered to a patient and **excluding** other messages immaterial to said healthcare delivered to said patient”. These features, in combination with the features of claim 1, are not shown or suggested in Schloss in combination with Judge based on its dependence on claim 1 and for reasons given below.

As recognized in the Rejection on page 12, Schloss fails to show or suggest “**filtering** a plurality of received messages to identify said message identifying **occurrence of an event** potentially affecting healthcare delivered to a patient”. However, the Rejection erroneously states Wright discloses this limitation in column 42 lines 37-41. Wright in this section states “events may be prioritized to allow filtering and masking during a query” and defines events as “the event type is the type or class of event (user-related, **data transfer**, etc.), and the event identifier is the event that occurred” (Wright column 39 lines 63-66). Wright therefore uses the term “event” to encompass computer system events such as data transfer etc. Wright also uses the term “event data” to refer to data associated with a cardiac stress test. “The text document segments of a report are generated from pre-test data, event data and post-test data. The pre-test data may include data such as patient demographics and the reason for the test. The event data preferably includes information such as a ten-second ECG analysis and measurements, blood pressure data and comments” (Wright column 65 lines 60-66). Consequently Wright does NOT show or suggest (or provide any 35 USC 112 enabling disclosure) of “**filtering** a plurality of received messages to identify said message identifying **occurrence of an event** potentially affecting healthcare delivered to a patient” and “**excluding** other messages immaterial to said healthcare delivered to said patient”.

Ser. No 10/051,664

PATENT
01P16949US01

Incorporating the Wright system filtering in the scheduling system of Schloss results in a system for initiating scheduling of tasks and subsequently determining if the tasks are still appropriate at a "prepare to perform time" involving filtering computer system messages indicating data transfers and the like and does NOT filter "a plurality of received messages to identify said message identifying occurrence of an event potentially affecting healthcare delivered to a patient". There is no suggestion in the combined references of use of an "identifier identifying a particular instance" of a process in combination with use of an "event identifier" identifying an event comprising a "change in circumstances potentially affecting healthcare delivered to a patient". Further, there is no recognition of the specific scheduling problem of inefficiency involved in altering and updating healthcare worker schedules because of the need to update scheduling at a "prepare to perform time" that is addressed in the claimed system. There is also no other reason or motivation in either reference for providing the claimed feature arrangement. Consequently withdrawal of the Rejection of amended claim 5 under 35 USC 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Amended dependent claim 14 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 11 and for reasons given in connection with claim 5. Consequently withdrawal of the Rejection of claims 1-27 is respectfully requested.

IV. Added claims 28 and 29.


Independent claims 28 and 29 are added. Claim 28 is a combination of claim 2 and claim 1 (prior to the claim 1 amendment made herein). Claim 29 is a combination of claim 6 and claim 1 (prior to the claim 1 amendment made herein). These claims are considered to be patentable for the reasons given in connection with claims 2 and 6 respectively.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that the Application is in condition for allowance, and favorable reconsideration is requested.

Date: February 25, 2005

Siemens Corporation
Customer No. 28524

Respectfully submitted,


Alexander J. Burke
Reg. No. 40,425
732-321-3023